

CIVIL COURTS.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT—Dec. 22.—Before Judge BETTS.

THE RIGHT OF RELEASER.—INTEREST OF PRIVATE PAPER.

This is a proceeding under the right of release of Judge BETTS of the United States Court of Appeals, Oliver and Cawse, Lawyers of this city, representing that they are engaged in business with various countries, and that they have import interests with Canada and Spain; but these importations do not pass through New York, and therefore the paper of record, *The New-York Times*, has been compelled to publish the notice that the papers were seized, and that the papers were taken by the Collector of Customs, and that no officer was entitled to seize them, and that another officer was entitled, under a warrant from Judge BETTS and sanctioned by the Custom House officials who carried off their books of account, letters, and private papers. This is an order directing Collector Sargent to make further arrangements for the defense of the claim, which will be submitted to the court, after hearing argument, ordered by the court to find a verdict for the Government, condemning the goods.

UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE.
Dec. 22.—Before Commissioner BETTS.

A SINGLE CHARGE OF COUNTERFEITING.
U. S. atty. Ronald McDonald.

The defendant is charged with having on the 5th inst., in a manner not clearly shown, caused Mrs. Mary Louis Cline, of Gravesend, N. J., to receive \$400 from him, and also for knowingly entering into a contract with him and also for knowingly entering into a contract of a false invoice and other false applications. The Court, after hearing argument, ordered the jury to find a verdict for the Government, condemning the goods.

JUDGE BETTS.—Before Judge BETTS.

The United States agt. Thirteen Cases Cotton and Woolen.

There was an action for forfeiture of the goods named for non-delivery in the manner in which they were entered, and also for knowing entering into a contract of a false invoice and other false applications.

The Court, after hearing argument, ordered the jury to find a verdict for the Government, condemning the goods.

DISORDERLY HOUSE NO. 1.—Simon D. Cline, a man whose real appearance would indicate that he ought to be a good, and probably does know, a great deal about the law, and who is in substance as follows.—That on the 5th inst. she received from Mr. Hunt, of 121 Pearl-st., in whose employ the defendant was, two checks, one for sixty, and the other for forty dollars, and that she requested him to cash them, which he did. She then came home and placed the money in her secretary, and a day or two after returned to Mr. Hunt's and made some purchases, paying in the money received from McDonald. She then left the house, and was received by her employer, McDonald. Several gentlemen, besides McDonald's employer, testified to his good reputation.

The case was adjourned until Thursday next.

SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS.—Dec. 22.—Before Mr. Justice INGRAM.

VALIDITY OF ATTACHMENTS—A QUESTION OF FRAC-

TICE.

Brown agt. Peyster, Marks agt. Same; Olney agt. Same. In each of these cases the same question arose, which is somewhat interesting, and involved lawyers. An attachment was made, and levied on the 5th of November last; and at the same time a summons was lodged with the Sheriff. No publication followed, and the actual service of the summons did not take place till after the trial.

The question is, whether the subsequent service of summons ensued to the benefit of the original levy, but the Court has decided that it did not, and vacated the attachment. Mr. Wingfield for defendant; Mr. Joachim, Mr. Birch, and J. Gosling for plaintiffs.

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS.—Dec. 22.—Before Judge CARDNO.

ARREST OF ALLEGED GAMBLERS.

Mr. Dunphy at the sitting of the Court made an application for an order of arrest for William McGinn and Robert Morris, proprietors of the gambling-house No. 11 Ann-st., in the city.

The affidavit made by Mr. Mooley, a merchant on Broadway, says: "That he has commenced an action in the Court of Common Pleas to recover the sum of \$8,000 from the defendants, and a sum of \$2,000 for costs, and for expenses, and for attorney fees for this amount and a sum thereto added." That defendant says that the defendants are the keepers and proprietors of a common gambling-house where they carry on the game of faro, and other illegal games.

Mr. Dunphy, on the 13th instant, and October, 1866, obtained from the plaintiff the sum of \$2,000 by fraud, misrepresentation, cheat and device, and by fraudulent practices in a game called faro, at their house, No. 11 Ann-st.

The order of arrest was granted, the bail being fixed at \$10,000.

Edwin James and Mr. Dunphy for plaintiff.

SUPERIOR COURT—CIRCUIT.
ACTION AGAINST THE SECOND AVENUE RAILROAD COMPANY. Administrator agt. Second-ave. Railroad Company.

In this action the plaintiff, as the widow of John Corbin, sought damages for an accident which resulted in the death of her husband, by being thrown from the cars of the defendants, in November.

The trial was without trial, the defendants paying the plaintiff \$2,000. Edwin James and Dunphy for the plaintiff, ex Judge Siessus and Mr. Hall for the defendants.

COURT CALENDAR—THIS DAY.

SUPERIOR COURT—CIRCUIT.

Faxes of U. S. are adjourned for the term.

PART III.—Hold by BALLOON, J. at 73, Duane-st.—Court opens at 10 o'clock a. m.

No. 2516—Hall agt. Webster.

2517—Same agt. Same.

2518—Bennett agt. Wasmann.

2519—Same agt. Butterfield.

2520—Clow agt. Miller.

2521—McGraw agt. John.

2522—Same agt. John.

2523—Ogden agt. Harwood.

2524—Same agt. Ogden et al.

2525—Same agt. Myers.

2526—Bellaine agt. Henry.

2527—Same agt. Same.

2528—SUPREME COURT—SPECIAL TERM.

Held by Judge BALCOM, at 73, Duane-st.—Court opens at 10 o'clock a. m.

No. 2529—Hastings agt. Bergin.

2530—Same agt. Fitch.

2531—Keller agt. Mattox.

2532—White agt. Hinckle.

2533—Milder agt. Foster.

2534—Same agt. The Metropolis agt. Great.

2535—MAINE COURT—CIRCUIT.

Held by Mr. Justice INGRAM.—Court opens at 10 o'clock a. m.

No. 2536—Hastings agt. Goodwin.

2537—Brookman agt. Eastern S. Co.

2538—Young agt. McGehee.

2539—Same agt. McGehee.

2540—Waddag agt. Gallager.

2541—Froestad agt. Higgins.

2542—Mitchell agt. Van Name.

2543—Corrigan agt. McAleny.

2544—Smith agt. Crowley.

2545—Whittemore agt. Thompson.

2546—Same agt. Vining.

2547—Same agt. Same.

2548—SUPREME COURT—CHAMBERS.

Held by Mr. Justice INGRAM.—Court opens at 10 o'clock a. m.

No. 2549—Hastings agt. Bergin.

2550—Same agt. Fitch.

2551—Keller agt. Mattox.

2552—White agt. Hinckle.

2553—Milder agt. Foster.

2554—Same agt. The Metropolis agt. Great.

2555—CRIMINAL COURTS.

Held by Mr. Justice KELLY and Dowling.

COURT OF SPECIAL SESSIONS.

(Before Justices Kelly and Dowling.)

One of the largest, and in some respects one of the most important sessions ever held before this particular tribunal was held in the Court-room of Special Sessions on Saturday last. There were 48 cases of all descriptions on the Calendar, which were divided as follows:

Assault and Battery... 15 Violation of Health Law... 1

Pet. Larceny... 17 Cruelty to Animals... 3

Robbery... 3 Suspended Convict... 1

Malicious Wounding... 4

Killing Unlicensed Sailors... Total... 45

Boarding House... 1

It will be easily seen that such an extensive field as this has the power of filling up the full extent of the courtroom. Some of them have received extra large fees on Saturday for they fought and abused each other with a bitterness perfectly to be attributed to having got one pocket full of money from the client before beginning the suit, and kept another pocketfull ready for the conclusion was reached.

James M. Conroy, Esq., for the defendant, argued briefly, and that the examination be adjourned for a few days.

Mr. Graham, before the motion to adjourn could be acted upon, wished His Honor to understand that his client had not given Patterson his address, and had not obtained any money from him.

Justice Dowling stated that he had not intended to allow

Justice Hogan's action in the master, as he considered it beneath his notice. He would remark, however, that he had not intended to allow it, and that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it, and that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.

He then said that he had intended to allow it.